VOL. XXV JUNE, 1914 NO. 2

Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia

WITH WHICH IS COMBINED

AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL RESEARCHES

Published Quarterly by the Society

715 SPRUCE STREET, PHILADELPHIA

Copyrighted, 1913

$2.00 PER YEAR SINGLE NUMBER, 50 CENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

THE AIR OF THE "STAR SPANGLED BANNER" 97
A Reply by W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD, Enniscorthy, Ireland.
Rejoinder by the REV. H. T. HENRY, Litt.D., Overbrook Seminary, Pa.

THE LIFE OF BISHOP CONWELL. Continued. 146
By MARTIN I. J. GRIFFIN; revised and Edited by the REV. LEMUEL B. NORTON.

The REVEREND HENRY G. GANSS, Mus.D. Biographical Sketch by L. A. D. With Portrait 179

ITEMS TRANS-ATLANTIC 183

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN IRISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY 192

F 44.1
F6593

FROM THE LIBRARY OF

REV. LOUIS FITZGERALD BENSON, D. D.

BEQUEATHED BY HIM TO

THE LIBRARY OF

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SCC
9541

RECORDS OF THE
AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOL. XXIV JUNE, 1914 NO. 2

THE AIR OF "THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER"

A REPLY

William Henry Grattan Flood

I have carefully read the long article on the above subject from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Henry, but I am not convinced in the least. The article runs to more than 45 pages, and I fear I must class it with the comment of Waller on Milton's *Paradise Lost*, so aptly quoted by Dr. Henry: "If its length be not a merit, it hath no other." It is not my intention to spread myself out, and I shall not occupy even a sixth of the space given to Dr. Henry's article, but I wish to take up his points *seriatim*, and deal briefly with them.

To begin with, it is gratifying that Dr. Henry will not deny an Irish origin to the tune. Even this is a concession for which the advocates of the Irish provenance of the air must feel duly thankful. And now for a short reply.

1. As regards "expert opinion", I hold by the Irish origin. The opinion with which I am credited, in the quotation from *Church Music*, is that of Dr. W. H. Cummings, and not mine. The absence of quotation marks leads to a wrong inference, as I quoted the words of my friend, taken from a letter. And, let me add, Dr. Cummings was at

fault. It is not a little remarkable that Mr. Sonneck in his *Report* (p. 20) also endeavors to discredit my reference to Dr. Cummings, but I have the letter before me as I write. Mr. Sonneck also without reservation (p. 27) quotes the air as by John Stafford Smith.

2. The Irish origin of the words of "Anacreon" is evident from even a cursory examination of the phrases: "lend ye", "inspire ye", "the devil a goddess", "risible fiz", etc.

3. The characteristics of the tune are Irish, and point to O'Carolan. My quotation from Dr. Cummings refers to the air being reminiscent of Dr. Boyce, which Dr. Cummings really believed. My own opinion is that the air is by O'Carolan, and I leave it to experts to study O'Carolan's many compositions in order to corroborate my opinion. Incidentally Dr. Henry waxes merry over my previous identification of the Irish origin of "Yankee Doodle", but my identification has been upheld by some of the ablest musical critics, and the Irish origin of the tune of "Yankee Doodle" is now an established fact.

4. It is distinctly uncritical to compare "Anacreon" and "Bumpers, Squire Jones" bar by bar, for even a tyro at tuneology (to coin a word) would be hopelessly muddled in endeavoring to trace variants. I myself have analyzed some twenty variants of one particular Irish melody, and each of these variants though of common origin presents notable bar differences, yet the tune is really the same. Let me assure Dr. Henry that the general structure and the slightly abnormal range of the melody of "Anacreon" are on all fours with that of "The Princess Royal", "Bumpers, Squire Jones", "Rodney's Glory", and other magnificent compositions of O'Carolan. I may also add that the earliest title of the song "Bumpers, Squire Jones" was as here given, not "Bumpers Esquire Jones", as Dr. Henry gives it. I fail to trace the remotest similarity between this air

and the "Virginia Reel" (the Irish Washerwoman) as suggested by Dr. Henry: in fact there is a much greater resemblance between it and a jig tune (not a Reel) known as "The Top of Cork Road" (Father O'Flynn). Dr. Henry has fallen into a trap by following Captain O'Neill's *Irish Folk Music* when he dates Burke Thumoth's Collection as 1720, and styles it "the *first* collection of Irish Airs." Both statements are wrong. The date of Burke Thumoth's volume was 1743, and Neale of Dublin had published an Irish Collection in 1726. Nor does Dr. Henry appear to be aware that the tune was printed in O'Carolan's Collection in 1747, and reprinted by John Lee in January 1779, not 1780.

5. The "Ratio Convenientiae" argument is worthless. Hullah is no authority to quote nowadays, and even Chappell, the great protagonist of English Music, has been discredited in dozens of cases, notably by the late Mr. John Glen. But I do not shirk the six instances quoted by Dr. Henry. Here they are:

(a) "The Girl I left behind me" is not an English air: it is certainly Irish, and has been proved so up to the hilt. For proof see the *Musical Times* for 1913.

(b) "My lodging is on the cold ground", far from being of "undoubted English origin", was printed as "a favorite Irish air", as far back as 1780; a fact of which Chappell and Hullah and his copyists were unaware.

(c) "Shepherds I have lost my love", claimed as of "English origin", was printed as an Irish air in 1714, set to phonetic Irish words, while the English words were set to the air by an Irishman, George Ogle, in 1760. It was also printed as an Irish air by Daniel Wright in 1727; but neither Chappell nor Hullah was acquainted with these facts.

(d) "O could we do with this world of ours" is also claimed as "a favorite tune from the time of Elizabeth."

The air is given by Tom Moore as "Basket of Oysters". In 1778 it was printed as an Irish air under the title of "The Basket of Oysters or Paddy the Weaver", and was previously included in an Irish collection of 1750. Earlier still in the seventeenth century it was known in Ireland as "An Rogari dubh" (the Black Rogue).

(e) After all that has been written on the Irish origin of the well-known "Cruiscin lan" (vulgarly "The Cruiskeen lawn") it is unscholarly to trot out Hullah's vagaries. The so-called "Danish" air, also claimed as English and Scotch, is as Irish as the Hill of Howth. Neither Chappell nor Hullah was aware that the air was printed by an Irish dramatist in 1729, nor did they advert to the fact that our Irish air was introduced into Denmark by the Irish harpers at the Danish Court. Incidentally, I may be pardoned for mentioning that three Irish harpers in succession were Harpers to the Danish Court from 1601 to 1634, a fact which I owe to the courtesy of my frined Dr. Angul Hammerich, of the University of Copenhagen.

(f) "Rich and Rare" has been sufficiently discussed, and it is more than probable that it is the original melody brought over by Irish monks to England and hence regarded as "English". It is too frequently forgotten that the monasteries of Malmesbury and Glastonbury were Irish, and it is also certain that St. Aldhelm and St. Dunstan were taught by Irish monks.

And now having disposed of these six "ascriptions of tunes", I hope that Dr. Henry will be more cautious in future in quoting at second-hand from either Chappell or Hullah, although he is good enough to describe Hullah as "an acceptable source". The "mutual borrowings" may be hard to unearth, but as a rule it is the English and the Scotch who are the guilty parties. Ireland never had any reason to borrow melodies from any country. She has always stood, and, please God, always will stand as "the land

of song", and "the island of saints and scholars". Of course, at the same time, I do not wish to minimize the efforts of Dr. Henry, who assures his readers that he makes his statements "with equal confidence, and from an equally acceptable source, with those of Dr. Flood".

I shall not waste any time in discussing Dr. Henry's "negative argument". Let me finish by briefly answering his four points.

1. The date of the copyright of the Anacreontic Song arranged as a Glee is 8 May, 1799. Dr. Henry quotes Mr. Sonneck's *Report* for the publication of the song, but he omits the Rhames copy of *circa* 1778, and he omits the musical setting in the Perth *Musical Miscellany* of 1786 (now before me) as well as a Dublin printed music score of 1791. Mr. Sonneck's "cautious attitude towards the prevailing ascription of the tune to Smith" is not borne out by the *Report*.

2. Smith arranged the Air as a Glee. Yes! he arranged it, and that was about all he did with it, and that badly enough. I take "harmonized by the Author" simply at its face value, that is to say, Smith, the author or editor of the *Fifth Book of Canzonets*, etc., arranged the melody as a glee; but it does not imply that he composed the song tune. And let me add that without further proof the title page shows that Smith's compilation could not have been prior to the year 1785, for he describes himself as "Gent. of His Majesty's Chapels Royal", a post that he only got on December 16th, 1784. Of course the actual date of publication, as Mr. Blake discovered, was 8 May, 1799.

3. "Smith never claimed the tune as his." He did not, for the best of reasons. During his long life this British musician never publicly owned the claim: and he allowed it to be printed by the thousand for forty years without once admitting his claim! Very like a Britisher! On May 8, 1799, he merely published a volume, with the melody ar-

ranged in glee form; not a word as to being the composer. If Dr. Henry is logical in assuming that Smith meant to pose as composer of the tune, he must also admit that Smith composed "God Save the King". The cases are quite parallel. In one case Smith arranged a tune as a Glee, and in the other he arranged a tune as Canon in Subdiapente. And let me add that "dear old Smith" (if I may be permitted to quote from Mr. Sonneck's lucid letter) in both cases was merely an arranger of melodies long before his time. In short, the argument for the ascription of "Anacreon" to Smith is miserably weak and will not stand investigation.

4. The authorship of the words is most likely of Irish origin. If Dr. Henry, or any one else, can substantiate Ralph Tomlinson's claim as original author then I apologize. Mr. Warrington merely relies on Dr. Cummings, but Dr. Cummings told me a different story, and so the matter rests. I have already noted some of the "Irishisms" in the song.

W. H. Grattan Flood.

A BRIEF REJOINDER

Hugh Thomas Henry

1. Dr. Flood, if quoting from Dr. Cummings, should have used quotation-marks. He nowhere gave a "reference" to Cummings as authority for his statements. But Dr. Flood did, in 1909, believe Smith to be the composer, for he then wrote in *Church Music*: ". . . I also examined the copy containing the *information* that the music was *composed* by John Stafford Smith." (Italics mine). It is clear that, in 1909, Dr. Flood held "author" to mean "composer" (in Smith's phrase, "harmonized by the author").

2. Dr. Flood's assertion is amazingly reckless. The argument is worthless, for the quoted expressions are not at all peculiarly Irish. I show this in my fuller rejoinder by quoting Milton, Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher, Urquhart, N. Bailey, etc., etc.

3. Dr. Flood should have placed quotation-marks when quoting from Dr. Cummings.

4. In his article, Dr. Flood said that "Anacreon" had "all" the characteristics of "Bumper", but failed to instance a single one. I printed both melodies side by side to show that they differed, not merely bar for bar, but also in (1) beginning, (2) ending, (3) rhythm, (4) length, (5) phrasing, (6) melodic progressions, (7) spirit. Dr. Flood's present argument based on musical structure and range is futile, as my fuller rejoinder shows. And Dr. Flood is wrong in respect of O'Neill, who gives 1742 and 1745 as the dates of two of Thumoth's volumes. I would also trust O'Neill for the other date of 1780.

5. I merely pitted ascription against ascription—Chappell and Hullah against Dr. Flood; and I expressly declined to discuss the objective value of any of the ascriptions. But Dr. Flood does "spread" himself in the quagmire of ascriptions, and misleads by using the word "shirk". He also is wrong about the "statements", for it was Hullah, and not I, who made the "statements". Also, one needs no caution in quoting at second-hand, if only one makes it clear that he is doing so. I made this clear by elaborately correct quotation-marks. Would that Dr. Flood had been equally correct in quoting from Dr. Cummings! I quoted at first-hand from Hullah, whose volume apparently has never been seen by Dr. Flood.

1. I did not "omit" anything, as I professedly quoted from Sonneck, who did not include the Rhames copy, etc.

2, 3. Dr. Flood writes so carelessly that even an Aristotle might (wrongly) infer that I had fathered the quoted headings. My article shows that they were based on that of Dr. Flood.

4. In 1909, Dr. Flood wrote in *Church Music*: "There is no doubt as to the fact that Ralph Tomlinson wrote the song in the winter of 1770". He now challenges me, or any one else, to prove that Tomlinson wrote it. Gentle reader, can you make anything out of this beautiful muddle?

H. T. Henry.

A FULLER REJOINDER TO DR. FLOOD'S "REPLY"

Hugh Thomas Henry

There are two interesting points in Dr. Flood's Reply. In both of these he offers some argument for two most important assertions which he had made in the *Ave Maria* article but for which he had not vouchsafed any proof, argument, citation or reference. The arguments he now brings forward should properly have been given in the *Ave Maria*, and I will consider them forthwith, because logically they belong rather to his original article than to his present Reply.

1. Proofs of the Irish Origin of the Text.

The section of Dr. Flood's Reply which he marks "2" is as follows:

> The Irish origin of the words of "Anacreon" is evident from even a cursory examination of the phrases: "lend ye", "inspire ye", "the devil a goddess", "risible fiz", etc.

In the *Ave Maria* Dr. Flood had stated, without any attempt at proof or argument, that the words of "Anacreon" are of Irish origin. If this statement were correct, it would be of the highest importance, as I showed in the Records. Dr. Flood now alleges his reason—not for considering the words as *probably* of Irish origin— but for stating, without any qualification or hesitation, that they *are* of Irish origin. It is rather amazing, in view of this certainty on the part of Dr. Flood, that he should appeal *only* to internal evidence; for not only is internal evidence a risky thing to depend wholly upon, but in Dr. Flood's hands it is especially risky; for, as I have abundantly shown in the Records, he

is quite unfitted to deal with the delicate and notably inconclusive "higher criticism" of internal evidence.

But now let us tackle this internal evidence adduced by Dr. Flood. From a poem of 48 very long lines he extracts four instances, and follows them with an "etc." This "etc." would, so far as I can see, include but one other illustration, namely, the phrase "instruct ye". Of the five illustrations we thus have before us, three are in precisely the same category: "Lend ye", "inspire ye", and "instruct ye". The three illustrations are, therefore, logically but one. What is so peculiarly "Irish" in them as to lead a critic of internal evidence to award a whole poem in which they occur to Ireland? Was John Milton an Irishman? But he writes: "They have, like your good sumpters, *laid ye* down their horse load of citations and fathers at your dore" (*Church Government*, ii). Was Shakespeare Irish? He gives us this: "The more shame *for ye*, holy men I *thought ye*" (*Henry VIII*, Act 3, sc. 1).

The same scene from the same play gives us these further examples: "But how to *make ye* suddenly an answer", "Out *upon ye*", "I *fear ye*", "a woman lost *among ye*", "I will not *wish ye* half my miseries", "I *warn'd ye*", "The burden of my sorrows fall *upon ye*", "woe *upon ye*". Every "ye" here is a plural in the objective case, precisely as every "ye" is in the "Anacreon" song from which Dr. Flood extracts his examples to make it "evident" that the words of "Anacreon" are Irish!

Milton, also, seems to prefer "ye" to "you" as an objective case. But I will quote only one more instance from him: "I *call ye*, and *declare ye* now, returned, Successful beyond hope, to *lead ye* forth," etc. (*Par. Lost*, X. 462).

The next illustration cited by Dr. Flood is: "the devil a goddess". Is this peculiarly Irish? The line in which it occurs will illustrate its use:

"The devil a goddess will stay above stairs"—

meaning, of course, that not one of the goddesses will "stay above stairs" (sc. with Anacreon, in Heaven). But this use of "devil" as an expletive, followed by the indefinite article, is not peculiarly Irish. It occurs, for instance, in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Coxcomb*: "The *devil a good word* will she give a servant," and in Digby's *Elvira*: "Why then, for fear, the *devil a bit* for love, I'll tell you, Sir." And there is the well-known couplet from Urquhart:

> The devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
> The devil was well, the *devil a monk* was he!—

in which there is a play on the word *devil*.

The final illustration given by Dr. Flood is: "risible fiz". Now the word "risible" is not peculiarly Irish, and the value of the illustration must lie in the word "fiz" or "phiz". The words occur in the line of "To Anacreon":

> Next Momus got up, with his risible phiz—

that is, Momus got up, with his laughing (or laughable) face, etc. Is "phiz" peculiarly Irish for "face" (or physiognomy)? But we find the word in N. Bailey's translation of the Colloquies of Erasmus: "Why, truly a Body would think so by thy slovenly Dress, lean Carcase, and ghastly *Phyz*." Also, in Garner's *Love at First Sight:* "the phiz-maker." If Dr. Flood desires more English illustration of all of the expressions he considers peculiarly Irish, I will furnish them.

I have taken up all the internal evidence alleged by Dr. Flood as making what he styles "evident", the Irish origin of the words of "To Anacreon". *Quousque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra?*

2. Proofs that O'Carolan Composed the Tune.

In the *Ave Maria* Dr. Flood had contended for O'Carolan's authorship of the tune, alleging that "Anacreon" had "all the characteristics" of a certain other

melody by O'Carolan. Dr. Flood did not specify even *one* of "all" these characteristics. He now specifies as follows (in his section "4"):

> Let me assure Dr. Henry that the general structure and the slightly abnormal range of the melody of "Anacreon" are on all fours with that of "The Princess Royal", "Bumpers, Squire Jones", "Rodney's Glory" and other magnificent compositions of O'Carolan.

Dr. Flood has here broadened considerably his basis of comparison. In the *Ave Maria* he had specified only one of the magnificent compositions, namely, "Bumpers, Squire Jones". Let us, however, pass over this broadening process, and consider his two present proofs: (a) "general structure", and (b) "slightly abnormal range of the melody of 'Anacreon'".

(*a*) "*General Structure*".

This is exceedingly vague, and means, practically, that any "expert" can take any view he wishes of such a vague thing as "structure"—or, better still, "general structure". So true is this, that a really critical authority like Mr. Sonneck, who is Chief of the Department of Music in the Library of Congress, met Dr. Flood's proof for the Irish origin of "Yankee Doodle" (namely, that "the very structure of this tune is seen to be decidedly Irish, and apart from any other argument intrinsic evidence should point to its Irish origin") by simply saying: "Since the structure of the melody has been claimed with equal enthusiasm as decidedly Hessian, Hungarian, Scotch, English, etc.—indeed, in his letter quoted above. Mr. D. F. Scheurleer called my attention to the similarity of 'Yankee Doodle' with the tunes of the itinerant Savoyards — Mr. Grattan Flood's manifestly sincere assertion cannot be accepted without very careful proof as 'intrinsic evidence'". (See Mr. Sonneck's *Report to Congress*, p. 146).

Really, Dr. Flood must try to show his readers the points of agreement in "general structure". Then his readers will have something definite upon which to work. It is unfortunately necessary to call for this definite argument; for Dr. Flood argues in generalities, and where he is forced to come down to any specific statements (e. g., as to the proofs of the Irish origin of the words) the weakness—nay, the absolute baselessness—of his proofs can be clearly exhibited.

And now, Dr. Flood's large phrase—"all the characteristics"—has dwindled to a single "characteristic", namely, that of "the slightly abnormal range of the melody of 'Anacreon'". This is, at least, slightly definite. But "Oh, what a fall was there, my countrymen!" From "all" the characteristics, he must fall down to this scarcely measurable thing—the melodic range of the two tunes. And this agreement in melodic range is not something startling, withal; for the melodic range is, he tells us, only "slightly abnormal"!

(*b*) "*Slight Abnormality of Range.*"

How shall I tackle this matter of "slight abnormality"? Like Hamlet, I feel that in Dr. Flood's "proofs" I am reading only "words, words, words". But let me place accurately the ranges of the two melodies, and then place, for comparison, the ranges of other old melodies which are not by O'Carolan.

The range of "Anacreon" is a twelfth; of "Bumper", a thirteenth. The two melodies do not agree even in range. But, argues Dr. Flood, both ranges are "slightly abnormal", and he insinuates that this slight abnormality is peculiarly characteristic of O'Carolan's melodies. Is it?

Even if it were—which it is not—what argument can be properly deduced therefrom? Could not an Englishman, familiar with the airs of Dr. Arne, Dibdin, and the "naturalized" Handel, have imitated their "slightly abnormal range" of melody?

All that I have to show is that old melodies not by O'Carolan present us with an equal amount of "slight abnormality." But I make my argument with not a little trepidation; for Dr. Flood will doubtless argue that all the instances I shall bring forward are instances of O'Carolan's melodies masquerading as of English, Scotch, and Welsh origin, for the reason that both their "general structure" and their "slight abnormality" of range prove "beyond the shadow of doubt", that they are "unquestionably" by O'Carolan, etc. However, I must chance this counter-demonstration, and go ahead.

I must first premise that "Anacreon" has a range of a twelfth. Now is it not curious that Dr. Flood should have such a very short memory as already to have forgotten his comparison (which he now declares that he borrowed from Dr. Cummings) of "Anacreon" with the song "Heart of Oak" by the *English* composer, Boyce? One fact about both melodies is that the range of both is just exactly a twelfth! Should, then, the "slight abnormality" of a twelfth be considered peculiar to O'Carolan? Dr. Flood's argument ought to prove that Dr. Boyce wrote the air of "Anacreon"!

But here are some other instances of old English songs ranging up to a twelfth: "Greenwich Park", "Cease your funning", "Peaceful slumbering on the ocean" (from Cobb's opera, *The Pirates*), "Blind Willie singing". And here are some instances of old Scotch songs indulging in a twelfth: "The Lass of Patie's mill", "Lochaber", "My Nanie, O", "Tibbie Towler", "Farewell to Ayr", "Dance to your daddy", "Whare live ye, my bonie lass?", "Coming thro' the craigs of Kyle", "My love she's but a lassie yet", "O this is no my ain lassie", "Awa, whigs, awa!", "The flowers of the forest". To this list should be added old Scotch songs which reach even a thirteenth: "Jock the laird's brother", "The bush above Traquair", "Locherroch

side", "The seventh of November". And here are Welsh songs which reach a twelfth: "The Camp", "The Dawn of Day".

The simple truth is that there is no force of the slightest kind in the comparison of the melodic ranges of "Anacreon" and "Bumper"; for the "slightly abnormal range" is not exclusively characteristic of O'Carolan. The very air ("Shepherds, I have lost my love") which Dr. Flood claims (section "5, c") to be an Irish one printed in 1714 has a range of a twelfth! Also, the tune of Moore's "Oh! could we do with this world of ours", which Dr. Flood claims ("5, d") to have been known in Ireland in the 17th century, has a range of a thirteenth!

Dr. Flood declared that "Anacreon" has "all" the characteristics of "Bumper". When forced to descend to particulars, he cannot given even one which will bear the test of careful scrutiny.

The two most important assertions in the *Ave Maria* were there unsupported by any kind of argument or reference. In his present Reply, Dr. Flood attempts some argument. Under investigation it is found to be absolutely worthless. And now let me go on to his Reply proper, and make my Rejoinder to it.

The Rejoinder Proper.

Dr. Flood dislikes the length of my article and very naturally considers ill-founded the trust I modestly expressed that it might not merit Waller's criticism of *Paradise Lost*. Dr. Flood, however, appears to be unconscious of the humor of the situation; for he links himself with Waller, while the world at large appreciates Milton's very, very long poem rather highly.

Dr. Flood affects brevity, but fails to achieve accuracy. He should also reflect that brevity does not necessarily exclude tediousness, as Philostrate takes the trouble to demonstrate to Theseus, in Shakespeare's play:

> A play there is, my lord, some ten words long,
> Which is as brief as I have known a play;
> But by ten words, my lord, it is too long,
> Which makes it tedious; for in all the play
> There is not one word apt. . . .

The " Reply " of Dr. Flood is similarly tedious; for in it, despite its brevity, *there is not one word apt.* The length of my article permitted me to be accurate, and now gives me the opportunity to be relatively brief in my analysis of the " Reply " to it.

Will my readers kindly remember that Dr. Flood's " Reply " is made to my article in the RECORDS for December, 1913? Wherever he wanders outside of the limits of that article (e. g., where he attacks Mr. Sonneck's *Report to Congress*, or dissents from the opinions of Dr. Cummings, or imports bits of irrelevant information) I am not called upon to follow him, howsoever he may draw the herring across the trail. For Dr. Flood is brief, but not at all concise.

Wherever I refer, in this present " Rejoinder ", to the RECORDS, my readers will understand that I refer to my article in the December issue, 1913.

In making my rejoinder, two methods are open to me. First, I might take Dr. Flood's assertions one by one, and patiently dissect and disprove them. This method would inevitably require much space and appear to justify the reproach that I am not brief. A worse result than this would be, however, the entanglement and bewilderment of the reader in the intricacies of dozens of winding alleys and by-paths that would lead him away from the main road into a wilderness, so that finally he could not see the forest for the trees. I suspect that such a result would accord fully with Dr. Flood's hope.

Another method would be to dissect his whole " Reply " and place the fragments under appropriate headings or categories, in order to illustrate the fact that his " Reply "

is a bundle of irrelevancies, reckless assertions, wrong insinuations, false implications, ambiguities, loose argument and loose statement; that Dr. Flood appears never to have learned the true meaning and value of quotation-marks; and, finally, that he is—consciously or unconsciously—adept in misleading a reader by implying things which he is unwilling directly to affirm. This method would also require much space.

Now I will combine these methods in such a way as to satisfy both the hasty and the leisured reader. The hasty reader, who has not sufficient interest in the whole matter to wade through a long, because a detailed, analysis and disproof of a most tangled and inconsequent argument may feel that my illustration of the first method will make unnecessary any further reading; for the italicised headings will also serve to illustrate the second method, and give some idea of Dr. Flood's mental processes. The leisured reader, who may also take interest in the matter at issue, will perhaps be willing to follow me in my further illustrations of the second method.

I. The Seriatim Method.

My illustration of this method will comprise two of Dr. Flood's points. In order to avoid unfair picking and choosing, I take the first two that present themselves. These are numbered 1 and 2 by Dr. Flood.[1] Any others would answer my purpose; and if Dr. Flood should hereafter desire me to take up any other two (whether consecutive or not is indifferent to me) I shall gladly do so. I suggest that only two points be taken up, in the interests both of the reader and of the magazine; for even two points will require, as I have said, an inevitably large consumption of space where the method followed is that of detailed analysis.

[1] No. 2 I have already considered in the preface to my Rejoinder proper.

SECTION " 1 ".

I begin, then, with number 1, and shall give every word of it under as appropriate headings as I am able to devise.

(*a*) *False Suggestion*, (*b*) *Ambiguity of Statement.*

As regards " expert opinion ", I hold by the Irish origin. The opinion with which I am credited, in the quotation from *Church Music*, is that of Dr. W. H. Cummings, and not mine.

The two sentences exhibit, in combination, a looseness of statement which makes a reader hesitate or, worse still, accept a conclusion that is really wrong. The first sentence gives the present view of Dr. Flood, which is also that contributed by him to the *Ave Maria* (6 July, 1912). The second sentence refers to the opinion contributed by him to *Church Music* (September, 1909), which is directly opposed to his present opinion. Dr. Flood declares the 1909 opinion " not mine " (that is, not Dr. Flood's). The reader will have observed that Dr. Flood skilfully uses the *present* tense: " The opinion . . . is . . . not mine." Of course, it is not his *now*. Does he then mean to declare openly that it was not his in 1909? No, he will not declare this openly; but he is apparently willing that the reader should so understand him, for the implication of the combined sentences is that Dr. Flood did not, in 1909, hold the opinion which he now rejects. I will show further on that he really did, in 1909, hold the opinion which he now rejects. The two sentences are therefore misleading, as they appear to imply what is the very reverse of the truth.

There is also ambiguity in the second sentence; for it speaks of the " quotation " (singular), whereas there are *two* quotations from *Church Music*, which appear on the same page (p. 296) of the RECORDS, and which are separated from each other by only six lines of text. Both quotations are in the form of separate paragraphs, and the

smaller type in which they are printed causes them to stand out boldly from the page. To which of these quotations does Dr. Flood now refer? He writes in such a loose fashion as to make one almost despair of answering him intelligently or intelligibly; for both extracts from *Church Music* affirm a conviction that John Stafford Smith composed the air. Let me repeat them here. The first extract is:

> In June, 1904, . . . Dr. Cummings, in his lecture on "Old English Songs" . . . proved conclusively that Smith was the composer. . . .

These are the words of Dr. Flood in *Church Music* in 1909. In them he declares explicitly his conviction that Dr. Cummings had proved conclusively that Smith was the composer. Does Dr. Flood wish us to understand now that when he wrote the above words he really did not mean to express his own view, but was merely rehearsing Dr. Cummings' opinion that Dr. Cummings had proved conclusively the authorship of Smith?

The second of the extracts from *Church Music* is as follows:

> Smith was in his 21st year when he composed the music in 1770-1. . . . The most decisive proof of the fact that the tune was composed by Smith is that he includes it in his *Fifth Collection of Canzonets, Catches, etc.*, in 1781.

It is obvious that both of these extracts affirm the same view, namely, that Smith composed the air. This second extract is from Dr. Flood's (1909) article entitled *Notes on the Origin of "To Anacreon in Heaven"*. Does he now wish us to understand that the whole article, or the portion given in the extract, was a quotation from some letter written to him by Dr. Cummings?

Now the first extract is taken from a sort of preface Dr. Flood wrote to his article, and both the prefatory matter and the article itself appeared in *Church Music*, September, 1909 (pp. 281-282).

That Dr. Flood certainly believed Smith to be the composer when, in 1909, Dr. Flood sent his "Notes" to *Church Music*, is evident from the following statement of fact:

The May issue, 1909, of *Church Music*, quoted from the Philadelphia *North American* (14 Feb.) a statement of a musician that he had discovered, in the British Museum, the Dublin copy of "Anacreon", as also Smith's *Fifth Book* (giving the Anacreontic Song and with it printing the phrase "harmonized by the author"—the musician concluding, from this phrase, that Smith was the *composer* of the tune). Thereupon Dr. Flood wrote to *Church Music* to say that the "announcement is somewhat belated. It is now six years since I examined the Dublin printed copy of the original song 'To Anacreon in Heaven', and I also examined the copy containing the *information that the music was composed*[2] *by John Stafford Smith* [italics mine] . . . In January, 1908, I was asked . . . to write some notes . . . on the original air to which the Anacreontic ode was sung . . . I herewith subjoin *my notes* [italics mine] on 'To Anacreon in Heaven', as doubtless they will prove of interest to many readers of *Church Music*. It is worthy of note that while 'Yankee Doodle' is of Irish origin, *the 'Star-Spangled Banner' had its provenance in England*" [italics mine].

All this makes it clear beyond the possibility of evasion that, in 1909, Dr. Flood did believe the air to be English, and to be Smith's composition. Now all this was by way of

[2] We have here the clearest possible evidence that, in 1909, Dr. Flood interpreted "author"—in the phrase "harmonized by the author"—in the sense of "composer", and that Dr. Flood therefore believed Smith to be the *composer* of the tune!

preface. Next followed his *Notes on the Origin* etc., which—as I have shown in the above extract—he styled "my notes", and in which he argues strenuously for Simth's authorship of the tune.

What, then, does he mean by now saying: "The opinion with which I am credited, in the quotation from *Church Music*, is that of Dr. W. H. Cummings, and not mine"? Does he mean that, both in his preface and in his article entitled *Notes on the Origin* etc., he was relying wholly on the opinion of Dr. Cummings? that he was merely reporting it? On the contrary, he says that he himself "examined the copy containing the information that the music was *composed* [not 'arranged'] by John Stafford Smith."

(*c*) *Ambiguity*, (*d*) *False Implication*, (*e*) *Irrelevance.*

> The absence of quotation marks leads to a wrong inference, as I quoted the words of my friend, taken from a letter. And, let me add, Dr. Cummings was at fault.

A reader of these two sentences might easily infer that there was a fault somewhere—either in the printing of Dr. Flood's article in *Church Music*, or in my own handling of the extract from *Church Music*; and that the fault took the form of an omission of quotation-marks. The fact is that Dr. Flood himself placed no quotation-marks, and gave no other intimation that he was quoting; and no reader could suppose that he was quoting. Indeed, Dr. Flood himself explicitly declared, in his article in *Church Music*, that he was the author of the "Notes" from which the extract was made, for he wrote of them as "my notes on 'To Anacreon in Heaven'" (See *Church Music,* p. 281).

"And, let me add, Dr. Cummings was at fault", says Dr. Flood. Here is a false implication; for any reader would suppose that Dr. Flood simply reported the opinion of some other person, without sharing it. The extracts from *Church Music* in the RECORDS (p. 296), which I have re-

printed here (see above) show, beyond the possibility of evasion, that Dr. Flood *did* share the opinion which he now implies that he was merely reporting.

But here, also, is an irrelevance; for the truth or falsity of Dr. Cummings' opinion has nothing whatever to do with the matter now in hand. We are dealing exclusively with the opinion expressed by Dr. Flood in the *Ave Maria* in 1912, which flatly contradicted the opinion expressed by him in *Church Music* in 1909.

(*f*) *False Insinuation*, (*g*) *Further Irrelevance.*

> It is not a little remarkable that Mr. Sonneck in his *Report* (p. 20) also endeavors to discredit my reference to Dr. Cummings, but I have the letter before me as I write.

Will the reader be good enough to read the above-quoted sentence again, and note particularly the skilful introduction of the word "also"? This word conveys an insinuation that in the RECORDS I had endeavored to discredit a supposed "reference" to Dr. Cummings in connection with what Dr. Flood styles "the quotation" from *Church Music* (sc. in the RECORDS, p. 296). What is Dr. Flood now talking about? I can conceive of no other "reference" in this connection than that contained in the first extract—or quotation—from *Church Music*:

> In June, 1904, . . . Dr. Cummings, in his lecture on "Old English Songs" . . . proved conclusively that Smith was the composer. . . .

In these words, Dr. Flood makes reference to Dr. Cummings, and to a *lecture* (not to a *letter*) by Dr. Cummings, and to conclusive proofs given in that lecture. Dr. Flood now insinuates that he had referred the conviction that the proofs were conclusive, to Dr. Cummings, and writes now that he has the *letter* (an entirely new thing, unmentioned

by Dr. Flood in his article in *Church Music*, or in his preface to that article) of Dr. Cummings lying before him as he writes.

> "Oh, what a tangled web we weave
> When first we practice to deceive!"

Everything would have been clear from the start, if only Dr. Flood had been willing to admit that his apparently learned information concerning the tune was in reality due to Dr. Cummings. Dr. Flood would not do this, but now insinuates that any reader ought to have known that the words "proved conclusively" were not an expression of Dr. Flood's, but were merely Dr. Cummings' own view as to the cogency of Dr. Cummings' own arguments!

Dr. Flood seems to associate me with Mr. Sonneck in a conspiracy "to discredit" Dr. Flood's "reference to Dr. Cummings". Perhaps Dr. Flood wishes his readers to think that he suspects a conspiracy. It is nevertheless certain that he has no such sinister suspicion; for no one knows better than himself that he nowhere referred to Dr. Cummings as his authority for his various statements.

Dr. Flood is using the word "reference" equivocally. He means an entirely different thing now from the "reference" given above in the extract from *Church Music*. For he gives the page in Mr. Sonneck's *Report* (p. 20), where a paragraph is quoted from the "Notes" he had sent to Mr. Sonneck. The reader will at once perceive that Dr. Flood is here treating of an entirely different matter from the question of "proved conclusively". Indeed, he here assumes the rôle of one who discredits the item of information given to him by Dr. Cummings! Here is the paragraph of Dr. Flood's as given in the *Report* (p. 20):

> The words and music of "To Anacreon in Heaven" were published by Longman and Broderip in 1779-1780, and were reprinted by Anne Lee of Dublin (? 1780) in

> 1781. Dr. Cummings says that he saw a copy printed by Henry Fought—at least it is made up with single sheets printed by Fought—but this is scarcely likely, as Fought did not print after 1770, and the song and music were not in existence till 1770-71.

The reference made here to Dr. Cummings is to the effect that Dr. Cummings "says" something which Dr. Flood disputes! Again, the word "says" does not imply a letter from Dr. Cummings to Dr. Flood; for "says" might equally refer to the "lecture" by Dr. Cummings, or to a book by him, or to a conversation between him and Dr. Flood. Mr. Sonneck interprets "says" as meaning probably a conversation; for he thus writes: "Apparently Mr. Grattan Flood reported part of a conversation with the distinguished English scholar . . . ". Why is Dr. Flood so secretive? If what he had to communicate to Mr. Sonneck or to *Church Music* was contained in a *letter* sent to Dr. Flood by Dr. Cummings, why could not Dr. Flood honestly admit the fact, and not strut around in borrowed plumage? At all events, Dr. Flood uses the word "reference" equivocally; for when he is applying the "discredit" business to me, he means a very different subject-matter from that which he speaks of when applying the discrediting to Mr. Sonneck.

Finally, the meaning of all of Dr. Flood's talk about an endeavor to discredit his "reference" is simply this: Dr. Flood wishes his readers to infer that he had made a "reference" to Dr. Cummings as authority for Dr. Flood's statements and arguments for Smith's authorship of the tune. The fact is, however, that Dr. Flood made no such "reference".

(*h*) *Clouding the Issue.*

> Mr. Sonneck also without reservation (p. 27) quotes the air as by John Stafford Smith.

In his *Report* (p. 20) Mr. Sonneck exhibits some doubt as to a sheet song mentioned by Dr. Cummings, and as to its bearing Smith's name as composer of the tune. Doubt number one. Again (p. 22) he points out that in Stewart's Vocal Magazine of 1797, the names of composers of many tunes are given in a separate index, but that Smith's name is not given for "Anacreon". Doubt number two. He nevertheless admits that Smith's phrase "harmonized by the author" renders it probable that Smith refers to himself as the composer of the music (p. 23). In all these cases, Mr. Sonneck is dealing with the question of the ascription of the tune. But even when he leaves this question, in order to consider that of the different forms of the melody, he takes new occasion to exhibit his lack of concurrence in the common ascription to Smith. For he writes:

> Probably Smith composed it, *if he really did compose the tune*, as a song for one voice. . . . Of course, *if* the *supposed* 1771 sheet song was a sheet song for one voice, and *if* it contained Smith's name as composer, then all *doubt* as to the original form and to the composer vanishes.

Would Dr. Flood, the ardent lover of brevity, require Mr. Sonneck to repeat all those expressions (the ones I have italicised) of hesitancy every time he mentions Smith's name? Surely Dr. Flood is aware of the canon that a writer's subsequent declarations are to be read in the light of his previous ones.

I have examined every sentence of Dr. Flood's section 1 and have discovered more errors than there are sentences. Although I have written as concisely as the interests of accuracy would permit, I have consumed much space. In strict justice, one further step is necessary. Having examined the section 1 *per partes*, I must finally consider it as a whole.

As a whole, section " 1 " is meant to convey to the reader that Dr. Flood did not, when he contributed his article to *Church Music* in 1909, believe that Smith composed the tune. As in the *Ave Maria* Dr. Flood tried to saddle Mr. Sonneck with the burden of an opinion which Dr. Flood held in 1909 but rejected in 1912, so now, in section " 1 ", he tries to relieve himself of the 1909 opinion by fathering it on Dr. Cummings.

In section " 1 ", therefore, Dr. Flood constructs for himself a dilemma, either of whose horns must be rather uncomfortable for him to rest upon. For either he relied on Dr. Cummings for the conviction of conclusive proof of Smith's authorship of the tune, or he relied on his own expert powers for that conviction. If he selects the former horn of the dilemma, Dr. Flood confesses that he himself is simply one of those " copyists " whom he sneers at in the *Ave Maria* and in his present " Reply " (section 5, b). If he selects the latter horn of the dilemma, he admits that which I charged him with (RECORDS, pp. 296-299), namely, declaring a certainty one day and flatly contradicting that certainty another day; for in 1909 he considered that Dr. Cummings had " proved conclusively " that Smith composed the tune, whereas in 1912 he considered that Mr. Blake had produced " indisputable evidence " that Smith did not compose the tune.

In making my detailed examination of only two (and part of a third) sections of Dr. Flood's " Reply ", I have used but one-tenth of his pages, and have nevertheless consumed much space, and have unavoidably done so. But I think I have given the hasty reader such a satisfactory view of the psychology of Dr. Flood and of the argumentative value of anything he writes, as to render unnecessary any further detailed investigation.

My next business is to give some illustrations which may interest the leisured reader. This I shall do under the heading:

II. The Categorical Method.

I have already illustrated many ineptitudes of Dr. Flood —his irrelevancy, his false insinuation and implication, his looseness of statement, his ambiguity. Let me now run through his other points or heads of argument, and pick out other illustrations of ineptitude. I shall indicate at the end of each extract the point or section whence I take it.

1. Quotation.

(a) My quotation from Dr. Cummings refers to the air being reminiscent of Dr. Boyce. (3)

(b) I may also add that the earliest title of the song "Bumpers, Squire Jones," was as here given, not "Bumpers Esquire Jones", as Dr. Henry gives it. (4)

(c) I hope that Dr. Henry will be more cautious in future in quoting at second-hand from either Chappell or Hullah. . . . (5)

(d) Dr. Henry, who assures his readers that he makes his statements "with equal confidence—and from an equally acceptable source—with those of Dr. Flood". (5)

This is a pretty good bunch of extracts illustrating Dr. Flood's idea of quotation.

As to (a), Dr. Flood placed no marks of quotation to indicate that he was quoting. Why not? Was it by accident or by design?

As to (b), I nowhere gave the title as "Bumpers Esquire Jones". In a footnote to the Records, page 304, I said that O'Neill gives it thus in his *Irish Folk Music*. I myself always gave the title either as "Bumper, 'Squire Jones" or in the condensed form of "Bumper". Is it impossible for Dr. Flood to quote accurately?

As to (c): One needs not to be cautious in quoting at second-hand, if only he is honest enough to make it clear that he is so quoting. I made it clear by most careful placing of quotation-marks (Records, pp. 310, 311) that I

was quoting always from Hullah, even when Hullah was himself quoting from Chappell. I did not pretend to be quoting at any time directly from Chappell. Would that Dr. Flood had been equally honest in his many "quotations" from that mysterious letter from Dr. Cummings! But Dr. Flood's insinuation that I also quoted at second-hand from Hullah is simply false. I suspect that the learned Doctor never has seen Hullah's volume; and I should be also fully justified in a suspicion, based on Dr. Flood's " quotations ", that Dr. Flood simply mirrors, in his insinuation, the devious windings of his own mind and the practices he himself indulges in.

As to (d), we are by this time quite ready to understand that, when Dr. Flood really quotes, he avoids giving the requisite quotation-marks; and that, *e converso*, when he does place quotation-marks, he garbles in one way or another. Now I did not assure my readers (RECORDS, p. 311) that I made the statements ascribing certain " Irish " tunes to English authors " with equal confidence " etc. I gave those statements or ascriptions professedly from Hullah, and declared that I did not purpose to enter into the correctness of the ascriptions. I then immediately added: " Whether the statements be objectively correct or not, they are made with equal confidence [sc. by Hullah, as the context shows]—and from an equally acceptable source—with those of Dr. Flood."

Before leaving the subject of " Quotation ", let me add the following illustrations (taken from the subsequent numeration, 1-4, at the end of Dr. Flood's article).

> (e) Dr. Henry quotes Mr. Sonneck's *Report* for the publication of the song, but he omits the Rhames copy of *circa 1778*, and he omits . . . [two others]

My list (RECORDS, p. 315) was, as I stated explicitly, " abbreviated from Sonneck's *Report* ". Dr. Flood—who

appears to have no idea of the requirements of fidelity in quoting others—declares that I omit the Rhames copy, etc. The fact is that I did not omit anything. The *Report*, whose list I professedly abbreviated, does not mention the Rhames copy, etc. How then could I omit what was not there? Had I inserted items not found in Mr. Sonneck's list, I should have been guilty of the literary sin so often committed by Dr. Flood—the sin, namely, of inaccurate quotation.

(f) Smith Arranged the Air as a Glee. Yes, he arranged it, and that is about all he did with it. . . .
(g) "Smith never claimed the tune as his." He did not, for the best of reasons.

A reader of my article must have noticed (RECORDS, p. 313) that the headings of the "Negative Argument" were based, not on my own opinions, but on Dr. Flood's article in the *Ave Maria*. It was not I who said that Smith had arranged the air as a glee. Dr. Flood had said that, and had included the word "merely". But Dr. Flood, slavishly following the argument of Mr. Blake, put the word *glee* in quotation marks ("glee"), as though Smith himself had so characterized his arrangement of the tune. I pointed out that Smith had *not* styled his work a "glee", as any reader of Dr. Flood's would have been misled into supposing. I wonder if Dr. Flood will ever learn the proper use of quotation-marks.

Again, my heading was not: "Smith never claimed the tune as his". My heading was: Smith "Never Claimed the Tune as His" (RECORDS, p. 320)—the marks of quotation indicating clearly that I was not expressing my own opinion. Dr. Flood's present language [given in (f) and (g)] would almost make an Aristotle suppose that I was fathering those headings.

Finally, the capital sin of Dr. Flood's in the matter of quotation is the one which I commented upon in the RECORDS (p. 297), and I beg to refer my readers to my comment thereon.

2. MISREPRESENTATION.

This heading may not be wholly accurate or wholly adequate, for I wish to include such things as evasion, *suggestio falsi*, etc. I will place a numeral after each extract in order to indicate the section of Dr. Flood's "Reply" from which it is taken.

But my first illustration is from the second paragraph of the "Reply":

> 1. To begin with, it is gratifying that Dr. Henry will not deny an Irish origin to the tune. Even this is a concession. . . .

This is an obvious misrepresentation of my clearly-expressed attitude. It was no "concession" for me to say that the tune might be of Irish origin, for "concession" implies that I desired to prove the opposite. I simply made it clear that Dr. Flood had failed in *his* arguments to prove a contention "which otherwise might enlist our hearty support" (RECORDS, p. 292). Again (RECORDS, p. 312) I wrote: "We should rejoice to know that the tune of 'The Star-Spangled Banner' was of Irish origin. Why, then, have we taken the trouble to investigate the value of the reasoning? Why not accept as a fact what would naturally please us so much?" And then I give the reasons for my investigation, one of which was in effect, that I did not wish Catholics here to be made ridiculous by trumpeting abroad the illogically reached conclusions of Dr. Flood and thus committing themselves to his logic. I am comforted to think that I was fairly successful. I think I love that "land of song" and "island of saints and scholars"

to which Dr. Flood refers in his "Reply", quite as dearly as does Dr. Flood; but I should hate to capitalize my love for it in any earthly coin.

> 2. My own opinion is that the air is by O'Carolan, and I leave it to experts to study O'Carolan's many compositions in order to corroborate my opinion. (3)

This is quite an evasion of the point at issue. For in his *Ave Maria* article, Dr. Flood adduced but one argument for his ascription of the tune to O'Carolan, and this argument was that the tune of "Anacreon" "has all the characteristics" of "Bumpers, Squire Jones". Did Dr. Flood thereupon commit the decision as to the merits of this argument to the "experts" he now speaks of? No, he there declared that his assertion could "easily be tested by a comparison" etc. He did not then speak of O'Carolan's "many compositions", either. But I made it easy for any one to compare the two tunes, and naturally Dr. Flood does not thank me for the trouble I took.

> 3. It is distinctly uncritical to compare "Anacreon" and "Bumpers, Squire Jones" bar for bar, for even a tyro at tuneology (to coin a word) would be hopelessly muddled in endeavoring to trace variants. . . . Let me assure Dr. Henry that the general structure and the slightly abnormal range of the melody of "Anacreon" are on all fours with that of . . . and other magnificent compositions of O'Carolan. (4)

One would suppose, from this excoriation of my uncritical procedure, that I had rested my demonstration on a test which even a tyro at "tuneology" (to quote the barbarous coining of Dr. Flood) would have rejected. What I really did (RECORDS, pp. 299-308) was, first, to exhibit in all its nakedness the learned foolishness of the argument from "internal evidence" as used by Dr. Flood. I next directly made the comparison desired by Dr. Flood.

To illustrate the significant facts that "Bumper" differed characteristically from "Anacreon" in (a) length, (b) rhythm, (c) phrasing, (d) beginning, (e) ending, (f) melodic progression, (g) spirit—to illustrate these characteristic differences between the melodies, I printed both melodies side by side, and I took the trouble to equalize them in key and—so far as possible—in time-measure, in order not to place any obstacle whatever in the way of the fairest comparison. But it did not suit Dr. Flood's grandiose "expert" methods to descend to any particulars. He simply had hoped that no one would take the trouble to make the comparison; and thenceforward he could triumphantly declare that he had "proved" his contention *nemine contradicente.* No, my dear Doctor, that kind of thing will not "work" any more. Even now you try to palm off on us that exceedingly vague thing which you style "structure", and which you also urged to demonstrate the Irish origin of "Yankee Doodle".

But at length, in his "Reply", Dr. Flood *does* allege *two* things in proof of his statement in the *Ave Maria* that the tune of "Anacreon" has "all" the characteristics of that of "Bumper." What are now his two proofs? I have already discussed them in the prefatory matter to my Rejoinder, and need not do more than refer to them here.

When an "expert" in "tuneology" is forced into a corner and has to fight for his oracular assertions, he may find that his own weapons are boomerangs; and we feel like repeating Cicero's indignant *Quousque tandem!*

4. But I do not shirk the six instances quoted by Dr. Henry. (5)

The word "shirk" suggests that I had challenged Dr. Flood—either explicitly or implicitly—to take up the six instances. The fact is that I had explicitly tried to avoid having him do so, for I could pretty clearly foresee into

what wildernesses and quagmires a discussion would inevitably lead, when "experts" in "tuneology" must be called upon, with their arguments from "the general structure", "internal evidence", etc., such as Dr. Flood loves to use. What I did was simply to accept, without questioning, the downright assertions of Dr. Flood (when he was "proving" the Irish origin of "Yankee Doodle"—see RECORDS, p. 309), and to place over against those assertions the "other side"—that is, the assertions of Chappell and Hullah (p. 310). Having done this, I then said: "Into the correctness of the above ascriptions of tunes it is not really necessary to enter here. Whether the statements be objectively correct or not, they are made with equal confidence—and from an equally acceptable source—with those of Dr. Flood." But Dr. Flood simply revels in such discussions, and despite my heroic endeavor to avoid the quagmires, he seized the opportunity offered him by the mere printing of the ascriptions, and pretends (by using the word "shirk") that I had in some way challenged him to deny the ascriptions.

> 5. It is not my intention to spread myself out, and I shall not occupy even a sixth of the space given to Dr. Henry's article, but I wish to take up his points *seriatim,* and deal briefly with them. (1st paragraph.)

Dr. Flood's method of following my points *seriatim* is to skip over those which he cannot even "reply" to, and to concentrate his energies on those which he thinks himself able to muddle up in some fashion or other. He really does not like brevity, as his long discussion of the "six instances"—which I had done everything possible to avoid having him take up—sufficiently illustrates. He therefore does "spread himself", where he imagines he can do so to advantage. Here are some of the points he failed to refer to in his "Reply":

1. He fails to tell us how he arrived at that wonderfully precise date of 1781 (RECORDS, p. 296 and p. 313) for Smith's Fifth Book. He did not know what the date was, when he wrote his *Church Music* article in 1909, and yet he gave a precise date, without question-mark or qualification of any kind, just as if he knew. The next year (October, 1910), Mr. Blake found the exact date to be 1799. Dr. Flood seized on this laboriously-obtained date and used it (in the *Ave Maria* article of 1912) as a club on the heads of Chappell "and his copyists", and on Mr. Sonneck. These gentlemen had signified clearly that they could only guess at the date; they did not, like Dr. Flood, pretend to an exact knowledge, for at that time nobody knew. Dr. Flood must have an amazing facility at forgetting his own previous acts; for how else can we figure it out, that he should be willing to pretend to a knowledge he did not have concerning the date, and then, when all the world at length knew the exact date, he should so shamelessly attack the men who had clearly stated that they did not know the date (for, indeed, nobody knew the date).

2. He passes over the "horrible example" I furnished (RECORDS, p. 297) of Dr. Flood's garbling in his quotation of "probably" from Mr. Sonneck's *Report*.

3. He passes over the attack (RECORDS, p. 298) he had made on Mr. Sonneck ("It is amazing how one writer blindly copies another")—for indeed the plea he now makes for his blunders (namely, that he himself merely copied from Dr. Cummings) would turn his whole "Reply" into a screaming farce.

4. He passes over (RECORDS, p. 299) my request for evidence to substantiate his contention that the words of the song "evidently emanated from Ireland about the year 1765".

5. He passes over every one of my *seven* illustrations of discrepant characteristics (summarized on p. 308 of the

RECORDS) except the one which deals with melodic progressions; and when he takes this one, it is not for the purpose of really considering it and answering it — for he does not even now instance any bars which are similar—but for the purpose of implying to his readers that I had rested my argument on that one characteristic, and that tyros in "tuneology" would be muddled by it.

6. He passes over my demonstration (RECORDS, p. 313) that he had placed himself amongst the "copyists" whom he so much ridiculed, when he had fixed a date eighteen years in advance of the true date of copyright for Smith's volume.

7. He passes over my exhibit that he had improperly placed *glee* in quotation-marks (RECORDS, pp. 319-20).

He passes over the whole question of "indisputable evidence" which he had claimed for Mr. Blake's researches (RECORDS, p. 320).

9. He passes over—with something like a sneer—the admirable argument in Mr. Sonneck's letter concerning the certificate of copyright (RECORDS, pp. 321-323).

10. He passes over the various enlightening illustrations furnished by Fr. Walworth's hymn (RECORDS, pp. 323-325).

11. He passes over my argument concerning Smith's inability to urge any *legal* claim outside of Great Britain (RECORDS, p. 327).

12. He passes over the argument based on Arnold's omission of the song from his collection of Anacreontic songs (RECORDS, p. 328).

13. He passes over my whole argument based on the English copyright law in force at the time Smith entered copyright (RECORDS, pp. 328-329).

14. He passes over—but I do not wonder at this—the wholly comic chapter on Smith's "audacity" (RECORDS, pp. 329-333).

Now it is not hard to be brief when one omits the bulk of a paper to which he is offering a " Reply ". The fact is that Dr. Flood is very unnecessarily long-winded in his " Reply " to the few points he does take up for consideration. And he introduces a number of irrelevancies that take up valuable space. Here are some occurring in one paragraph (" 4 "):

> 6. Dr. Henry has fallen into a trap by following Captain O'Neill's *Irish Folk Music* when he dates Burke Thumoth's Collection as 1720, and styles it the "*first* collection of Irish Airs ". Both statements are wrong. . . . Nor does Dr. Henry appear to be aware that the tune was reprinted in O'Carolan's Collection in 1747, and reprinted by John Lee in January, 1779—not 1780.

Dr. Flood himself has fallen into a trap by assuming that I had here followed O'Neill, who does *not* give the date as 1720 for Thumoth's Collection, but instead gives the date of 1742 for Thumoth's *Twelve Scotch and Twelve Irish Airs* etc., and 1745 for his *Twelve English and Twelve Irish Airs*, and gives these same dates on two different pages —pp. 189, 237—and furthermore says that he possesses both volumes. Dr. Flood gives the date of 1743. I do not pretend to know whether he or O'Neill is correct. But Dr. Flood's willingness absolutely to date (without question-mark or qualification of any kind) Smith's *Fifth Book* as 1781, without knowing at all whether that date was even approximately correct, makes me lean to the dates given by Captain O'Neill. It is an irrelevancy even to mention the date in a brief " Reply " that omits so many prominent points of an opposite argument. But what follows in the extract given above is even less relevant, and is intended merely to exhibit Dr. Flood's bibliographical learning. But it was not I who gave the date of 1780, which Dr. Flood particularly assures us should be one year earlier. It was

O'Neill who gave that date, and I formally credited it to him (in the footnote to page 304 of the RECORDS). And whether O'Neill or Dr. Flood is correct, I shall not pretend to judge—although under the circumstances I again feel it safer to rely upon O'Neill.

I end with Dr. Flood's closing paragraph, which contains this:

> 7. If Dr. Henry, or any one else, can substantiate Ralph Tomlinson's claim as author [of the words] then I apologise. Mr. Warrington merely relies on Dr. Cummings, but Dr. Cummings told me a different story, and so the matter rests.

But in Dr. Flood's article in *Church Music* (1909) he wrote:

> However, it is now tolerably certain that the song was written by Ralph Tomlinson in 1770 or 1771, as the charter-song of the Anacreontic Society. . . .
> There is no doubt as to the fact that Ralph Tomlinson wrote the song in the winter of 1770.

The reader may think it strange to find Dr. Flood hesitating, in the first of these two sentences, as to the year—1770 or 1771; and then, in the second sentence, flatly asserting the date as "the winter of 1770", without any "tolerably certain" about it. The two sentences are separated, in the article in *Church Music*, by only one intervening sentence! However, it is clear, from both sentences, that in 1909 Dr. Flood was certain of the authorship of Ralph Tomlinson. Just here comes in a great difficulty. Will Dr. Flood say—as he has more than once said, in his "Reply", when wishing to unload his 1909 assertions upon Dr. Cummings—that in so roundly asserting Ralph Tomlinson's authorship, he was simply expressing the opinion of Dr. Cummings? He cannot well do this now, for it ap-

pears (from the last paragraph of his "Reply") that Mr. Warrington's reference to Dr. Cummings as his authority for the authorship of Tomlinson is *not* upheld by Dr. Flood's memory of what Dr. Cummings said to Dr. Flood upon this precise point: "Mr. Warrington merely relies on Dr. Cummings, but Dr. Cummings *told me a different story*", says Dr. Flood (italics mine). It must follow from all this that, in 1909, Dr. Flood asserted *on his own responsibility*, that: "There is no doubt as to the fact that Ralph Tomlinson wrote the song in the winter of 1770." And now, in his "Reply", Dr. Flood challenges me, or anybody else, to prove that Ralph Tomlinson wrote the song! Gentle reader, what can you make of the whole beautiful muddle?

L'Envoi.

Readers who may think my "seriatim" and "categorical" methods somewhat drastic in their application to Dr. Flood's "Reply", should read the "Rejoinder" made by the Rev. Thomas Gogarty to Dr. Flood's "Reply" ("The Dawn of the Reformation") in *The Irish Theological Quarterly* for January, 1914. Fr. Gogarty's Rejoinder is twice as long as Dr. Flood's Reply, but is concise, clear, incisive.

Of course, Dr. Flood, in his first paragraph, pleads that he does not mean to "reply fully", as to do so "would occupy more space than the Editors could be expected to allow me", and hence deals "only with the graver issues, and particularly with the inaccuracies" of Father Gogarty's previous article.

Apropos of this matter of brevity, so much affected by Dr. Flood, let me quote the following from Father Gogarty's Rejoinder (p. 89):

> The assertion so carelessly worded in the second last sentence of this paragraph [of Dr. Flood's Reply] is sadden-

ing, because it is so unwarranted. If Dr. Flood had only established this "absolute certainty", if he could have shown his readers that all the nine Bishops of Munster were absent from Clonmel on January 22nd, 1539, he would have performed for Irish Church History the most valuable service of his life. But he forsook a golden opportunity on the specious plea, that the editors could not be expected to afford him the space he would need for such a full reply.

In reading Fr. Gogarty's Rejoinder, I was struck with the wonderful agreement of his strictures with those which I had to make in the December issue, 1913, of the RECORDS. I had there to call attention to Dr. Flood's misquotation, positive assertions without proof or reference, extravagant use of superlative language, impeaching of Smith's veracity, etc. And here, similarly, are points in Dr. Flood's Reply to which Fr. Gogarty has had to call attention::

[1] A singular looseness of argument is displayed in one of his proofs . . . (p. 84).

[2] This is another instance of a careless misuse of authority on the part of Dr. Flood (p. 84).

[3] Hamilton has led Dr. Flood astray. . . . The learned Doctor would have done well if he had checked his authority before he used it (p. 85).

[4] It is not sufficient [for Dr. Flood] to impeach the veracity of Robert Ware (p. 85).

[5] Dr. Flood roundly asserts that Browne's Commission and letter of 1535 have been proved to be downright forgeries. He has strangely omitted to name the writer who has proved them forgeries. He quotes no authority and he gives no reference (p. 86).

[6] His [Dr. Flood's] language is loose. . . . Besides—the grammatical structure of his sentence is very faulty—I did not overlook, but I did not mention the fact that . . . [because Fr. Gogarty] was dealing

with the reign of Henry VIII., and not with his predecessors, and no mention of the fact was called for (p. 87).

[7] I have held that it [a certain story or relation] is not to be cavalierly rejected "as a barefaced lie". I wrote this because I had read an article by Dr. Flood, in which he used these words in describing this story. I arrayed a long number of facts to support my contention, and Dr. Flood has not been able to impugn a single one of them. . . . He proceeds, and his mistaken judgment betrays him into assertions for which he has not the slightest grounds. He writes with an astonishing audacity "that there is ample evidence to prove" . . . He fails to put his ample evidence on record, and he fails even to indicate the source or sources from which it may be drawn. If he has evidence that . . . , he knows more about these prelates than any other living writer, and he might have taken his readers into his confidence, and quoted his authorities, or given his references, but he has withheld them. Dr. Flood asserts with his usual force that . . . was *not* at Clonmel, but again he can put forward no argument nor can he quote an authority for his statement. All these statements rest upon the *ipse dixit* of Dr. Flood (p. 88).

[8] I confess that I cannot appreciate the relevancy of a single statement made by Dr. Flood in paragraph 5.

[9] . . . the point upon which I did lay stress was that three of these four Bishops . . . took oaths that were satisfactory to Henry as claiming the Supreme Headship of the Irish Church. Dr. Flood rather lightly dismisses these oaths and states that the expressions of fidelity in question "were merely expressions of loyalty, and *certainly* did not imply supremacy." I shall ask my readers to mark the word *certainly* while they note the following fact: . . . the text of the oath sent over by Henry to be taken by the Irish Bishops is preserved. . . . The following extracts

will show whether or not the oath was a mere expression of loyalty, and whether or not it implied an acknowledgment of Henry's spiritual supremacy:

"You shall swear that you bear faith, truth, and obedience, *all only to God, to the King's Majesty, your Sovereign Lord, Supreme Head on Earth under God of the Church of England and Ireland* during his life. . . . And you shall now swear and protest that you shall utterly forsake, forego, and renounce all manner title, claim or interest, that in maintaining the bishop of Rome's unlawful, usurped power and authority you might have, pretend or allege in any wise to the said bishopric of N——, by any manner, decrees, canons, bulls, or election, but acknowledge and confess to have, and to hold the same entirely, *as well the spiritualities as the temporalities* thereof, only of the King's Majesty and Crown royal of this realm *immediately under Christ, Supreme Head of the Church of England and Ireland*," etc., etc. (pp. 89, 90).

I have slightly omitted from this oath, but have left in sufficiently explicit testimony as to the nature of the oath which, Dr. Flood declared, "certainly did not imply supremacy".

A much larger question than the proper ascription of the air of our national song appears to have emerged from the dust of our discussion. The question is really one of Dr. Flood's psychics or mental processes.

H. T. Henry.

FINAL ANSWER TO DR. HENRY'S REJOINDER. *

William Henry Grattan Flood

Let me begin my answer by referring to the bad taste of Dr. Henry in dragging in a controversy which has recently been appearing in the *Irish Theological Quarterly* (January, 1914). Of course, at the time of writing, Dr. Henry had not seen my Reply to Father Gogarty's "Rejoinder", which is in the April issue, and he might fairly have suspended his judgment.[1] However, I am consoled by the fact that some of the highest dignitaries in Ireland have written to me congratulating me on my defence of the Irish Bishops at a critical period of Ireland's history, and giving me their unstinted praise for the demolition of the specious argument put forth by Fr. Gogarty. My "impeachment of the veracity" (!) of Robert Ware is unequivocal, and it is as certain as day is

*[Dr. Flood's Final Answer includes misquotations, misstatements of fact, and entirely new matter for discussion. It therefore goes beyond the just limits of a Final Answer, and I take the liberty of pointing out these excesses and of commenting briefly in footnotes.—H. T. HENRY.]

[1] [Dr. Flood should have added that the *Quarterly* printed his Reply and followed it with Fr. Gogarty's Rejoinder, and gave no intimation whatever that the discussion was to be resumed three months later. My action is justified by the April *Quarterly*, which I have now seen, and which contains Dr. Flood's attempted answer in the form only of a *postscript* (spontaneously offered by Dr. Flood) to a second article continuing the attack on Fr. Gogarty. Moreover, in his postscript reply, Dr. Flood does not meet the itemized arraignment I quoted from Dr. Gogarty's Rejoinder, but reasserts two of his contentions, proves neither —and leaves the other items of the indictment to the vague future ("At another time I purpose to answer fully" is Dr. Flood's triumphant refutation).—H.]

day that the *sole* authority on which Fr. Gogarty relied for the earlier mission of Browne to Ireland is the forged document of the mendacious Ware, the unworthy son of Ware the eminent historian. I pass over Dr. Henry's epithets regarding "Dr. Flood's misquotation, positive assertions without proof, extravagant use of superlative language," etc. Words, idle words. Like Father Gogarty, Dr. Henry is still a young man, and, as Cardinal Newman once wittily quoted, "even the youngest among us is liable to mistakes." So much for "L'Envoi."

I think it more logical, for I, too, read a philosophy course (at Mount Melleray and All Hallows), to take up Dr. Henry's points *seriatim*.

1. Internal evidence shows[2] the Irish provenance of the words of "Anacreon". This statement I hold by. I really do not require stale extracts from Milton, or Beaumont and Fletcher, or Digby, or Bailey. They are quite familiar to me. I can merely echo *Quousque tandem*, etc.

2. On the question of the structure of a tune I fancy I know quite as much as Mr. Sonneck or even Dr. Henry, and I feel satisfied that O'Carolan composed the air. Just as a trained architect can judge the style of a building, so also a trained musician can place the period at least of a composition; it is worse than puerile to conjecture that O'Carolan might have imitated the style of Boyce or Arne.[3] I was not aware that "Peaceful slumbering on the ocean" was an "Old English Song". It was really composed by Stephen Storan, the son of an

[2] [If Dr. Flood has any further "internal evidence", why does he not gratify our eyes by a sight of it? My "stale extracts" quite demolished what he had thus far offered, and in a manner so complete as not to be devoid of a humorous feature (see present number of the RECORDS, pp. 105-107).—H.]

[3] [A misstatement of fact. I nowhere made the conjecture mentioned by Dr. Flood.—H.]

Italian fiddler. As to "Shepherds, I have lost my love," it was composed by O'Carolan.

3. Dr. Henry with a childlike innocence pretends not to understand plain English. Surely he must be aware that in my article contributed to *Church Music* when I stated that I had examined the copy on which was vouchsafed the information giving Smith as "composer" or "author"—it matters little—I meant simply what was printed on the title page,[4] and the inference merely amounted to the fact that Smith composed or arranged the "setting" of a glee.

4. Dr. Henry would fain rejoice to know that the tune was of Irish origin, and he says he loves the land of song. This statement of his reminds me of Sheridan's oft-quoted song: "'Twas all very well to dissemble your love, but why did you kick me downstairs?"[5]

5. When Dr. Henry can spare time he might usefully employ it in studying O'Carolan's compositions, of which there are 28 in such an accessible work as Moore's *Irish Melodies*.[6] This would be more profitable than to spread

[4] [A sort of new idea introduced by Dr. Flood: "the information giving Smith as 'composer' or 'author'—it matters little". But Smith's song did not say "composer"; it said "author". And in 1909 Dr. Flood interpreted "author" to mean "composer", and described his interpretation as the "information" given by Smith. Dr. Flood therefore held Smith to be the "composer"—and to-day he denies that Smith was the "composer".—H.]

[5] [By the way, Dr. Flood speaks (No. 1) of "stale extracts"! He really *discusses* no point of our previous argument, but consumes space in personalities, and in irrelevancies such as are found in his two closing paragraphs.—H.]

[6] [It is an intrusion of new matter for Dr. Flood to recommend Moore's *Irish Melodies* for a study of only "28" tunes by O'Carolan. I therefore call his attention to a fuller—and an equally accessible—work, namely, ONeill's *Music of Ireland*. O'Neill's work was published in 1905—less than ten years ago—and contains 75 tunes by O'Carolan, while Moore's has only "28"! But neither Moore's nor O'Neill's work can be depended upon for correctness in the case of O'Carolan's tunes. I contribute this information freely to Dr. Flood.—H.]

himself out in writing of my methods, which, *as a professor of Christian charity*, he describes as "dishonest", "equivocal", "devious", "evasive",[7] etc.

6. I leave my logic in the hands of better and more expert authorities than Dr. Henry. At some future date he will doubtless regret his intemperate language.[8]

7. It is too absurd to argue that Smith could not make any legal claim[9] on his own tune, if, as Dr. Henry assumes, he composed it. Why did he not put forth his claim? Dr. Henry ought really get a handbook on English copyright law. Did Bishop ever copyright his "Home, sweet home"? No, because he did not compose it. He merely mangled the air, just as Smith did.

8. I leave my "bibliographic learning" to scholars. Captain O'Neill can inform Dr. Henry that he based his own data on my bibliography.[10]

9. When I stated that Ralph Tomlinson wrote the song of "Anacreon" in 1770 or 1771, I meant the *tinkered* version; because the Irish version was written at least 20

[7] [Three misquotations. Nowhere have I used the words "dishonest," "equivocal", "evasive," which Dr. Flood nevertheless puts in quotation-marks.—H.]

[8] [I leave Dr. Flood's logic in the hands of the readers of the RECORDS.—H.]

[9] [A misstatement of fact. I never argued that Smith "could not make any legal claim on his own tune". My words were: "If Smith had copyright, he could vindicate it nowhere save in Great Britain" (RECORDS, p. 327); and in my Fuller Rejoinder I phrased the thought as "Smith's inability to urge any *legal* claim outside of Great Britain". If Dr. Flood will read some handbook on English copyright, he will perceive that what I said is absolutely correct. Dr. Flood, however, contents himself with misrepresenting what I said and with an added sneer about a "handbook", and will not take the trouble to read anything about the English copyright law existing in Smith's time.—H.]

[10] [New matter—and apparently incorrect; for O'Neill differs completely from Dr. Flood in the bibliographical data in question.—H.]

years previously.[11] It may surprise Dr. Henry now to learn that "Anacreon" was sung at Smock Alley Theatre, Dublin, on June 21st, 1762, by Mr. Kear, as it was previously sung on November 25th, 1755.[12] Probably Tomlinson tinkered the Irish version, and made it the charter song of the Anacreontic Society.

10. Let me add that another famous song[13] of the war of 1812–1814, "The Constitution and the Guerrière", was set to the old Irish air of "Oh Dandy O". The origin of the air has been claimed as "English" by Louis C. Elson, but it is sufficient to mention that it was printed by a Scotch publisher as an "Irish" air in 1788, and by another Scotch publisher, in his "Curious Selection of Fifty *Irish* Airs", in 1791, long before the English cribbed it. I must, however, forgive Mr. Elson, because he frequently confounds English and Irish; and, in his *National Music of America*, in recounting the gallantry of Captain Kane in the harbor of Apia, on March 15th, 1889, he twice alludes to "the *English* Captain Kane": unaware that Captain Kane, now Rear Admiral Sir Henry Cory Kane, K. C. B., is an Irish Catholic (the son of Sir Robert Kane of Cork), a pupil of the Irish Vincentians.

[11] [Entirely new matter—and quite incorrect. The "Anacreon" dated "1770 or 1771" by Dr. Flood was not a "*tinkered*" version. Also, it is incorrect to say there was an Irish version "written at least 20 years previously", or even one year previously, or indeed at any previous time.—H.]

[12] [Entirely new matter—and quite incorrect. The song we are discussing (namely, "To Anacreon in Heaven") was not sung in Ireland in the year 1762, nor had it been sung anywhere in 1755.—H.]

[13] [The whole long paragraph is not only entirely new matter, but wholly irrelevant matter. Dr. Flood really does not love brevity, for he consumes much space in irrelevancies and meanwhile leaves absolutely untouched a very large amount of questions he should have discussed (e. g., the "things passed over", as I point out in my Fuller Rejoinder (pp. 130, 131).—H.]

11. I sincerely hope that the anniversary of "The Star Spangled Banner" will be fittingly observed in America next September. Some Anglomaniacs aver that the air is "unvocal", "unsuitable". etc., but it is a fine Irish air, and is aptly wedded to the rousing verses of Francis Scott Key.[14]

W. H. Grattan Flood.

P. S.—It may be well to place on record the fact that "Anacreon" was sung at Smock Alley Theatre, Dublin, on June 21, 1762: the singer was Mr. Kear (see *Faulkner's Dublin Journal* for contemporary notice). A similarly named air was previously sung by Jenny Wilder at Edinburg on November 25, 1755. Unfortunately my notes do not state definitely if the two Anacreontic songs are the same, but it seems most likely that the Smock Alley song was what was invariably known as the Anacreontic song, that is, the song commencing: "To Anacreon in Heaven."[15]

[14] [The whole paragraph is, of course, irrelevant. "It is a fine Irish air," says Dr. Flood. If he could only prove this or if he could only furnish a probable basis for conjecturing it, instead of doggedly asserting it, he would make me his grateful debtor.—H.]

[15] [In saying that "To Anacreon in Heaven" was "invariably known as the Anacreontic Song," Dr. Flood decides the whole controversy *in favor* of John Stafford Smith. For Smith, in the title-page of his Fifth Book of Canzonets, declares himself the author of "the Anacreontic, and other popular songs."

On the other hand, if the "Anacreon" sung at Dublin in 1762 is assumed to be the same song as "To Anacreon in Heaven," it is an equally fair inference that the "Anacreon" sung in Edinburgh in 1755 was also the song "To Anacreon in Heaven." And here the humor of the situation crops out once more; for now, as 1755 is earlier than 1762, we should have to conclude that "To Anacreon in Heaven" is really neither English nor Irish, but Scottish!

With respect to the songs styled "Anacreon" and sung in the years 1755, 1762, Dr. Flood can not identify them with the song "To Anacreon in Heaven." The 17th and 18th centuries were prolific in convivial and love songs following the inspiration of the Greek poet Anacre-

It is also well to note that Smith *did* actually compose an Anacreontic song which he published in 1780, but the air is totally different from "To Anacreon in Heaven."[16]

Hence he could claim to be the composer of "The Anacreontic" song, and this is precisely what he printed in his *Fifth Book of Canzonets*, published in 1799 (May 8, 1799.) But, be it understood that Smith's Anacreontic is not our Anacreontic. There is as much difference between the Anacreontic song published by Smith in 1780 and the Glee arangement of the Anacreontic song (To Anacreon in Heaven) published in 1799 as there is between a blind Venetian and a Venetian blind. We shall allow Smith any éclat to be derived from the former songs, but most certainly not the latter.

It is very significent that the first printed verses of "Anacreon" emanated from Rhames of Dublin, while a Dublin musician Smollet Holden, in 1798 (a year before Smith issued his *Fifth Book*) arranged the air for the Dublin Masonic Orphan School, with new words by

on, and borrowing his name for a general descriptive title. Thus, in 1656, Cowley's "*Anacreontiques*; or Some Copies of Verses translated out of Anacreon;" thus, in 1706, Phillips defines "Anacreontick Verse" as consisting of "seven syllables, without being tied to a certain Law of Quantity . . . ;" thus, in 1749, in the *Power of Numbers* in *Poetical Composition*, "Anacreontic Verse" is described as "usually divided into stanzas, each stanza containing four Lines which Rime alternately." In 1785, Dr. Arnold published a collection entitled: "The Anacreontic Songs for 1, 2, 3, and 4 voices composed and selected by Dr. Arnold and dedicated to the Anacreontic Society" (London, J. Bland, 1785). In 1800, Tom Moore, while still a collegian, wrote his metrical translation of the "Odes of Anacreon." The 18th century rejoiced in several Anacreontic Societies. In this flood of Anacreontica how many minor and forgotten versifiers may have written songs that could briefly be styled "Anacreon"!—H.]

[16] [This is not new matter, but has so peculiarly the air of being so, that I venture to refer the reader to my original article in the RECORDS for Dec., 1913, p. 293., where I speak of the 1780 volume of Smith's in connection with his 1799 volume.—H.]

Brother Connell, and included it in his *Selection of Masonic Songs* (1798) of which a second edition appeared in 1802.[17]

W. H. G. F.

[17] [I think it is quite inaccurate to describe the Rhames edition as the "first printed version." Dr. Flood assigns no reason for his absolute statement, gives no date, fixes no limits within which a probable date might even be conjectured. Furthermore, if the "Anacreon" of Rhames, which was published probably between the years 1775 and 1790, is the same as the "Anacreon" of the years 1755, 1762, it is not easy to conjecture why a song which was sung at Edinburgh in 1755 and in Dublin in 1762 should have had to wait so long for its first appearance in print.—H.]

LIFE OF BISHOP CONWELL

BY MARTIN I. J. GRIFFIN.

CHAPTER VII

Opinion and Career of Dr. Rico. The Bishop's partisans carry off the Church Vestments and Vessels. Meetings and further procedure of the Trustees and Congregation. The Church closed. Hogan excommunicated. Consecration of Baltimore Cathedral.

Hogan had cited in his pamphlets a formidable array of texts from the Canon law, to prove the Bishop in the wrong for suspending him, and to establish Hogan's right to continue as pastor of St. Mary's. The force of these canons had been questioned not only by the Bishop and his upholders in Philadelphia, but also, as we have seen, by Bishop England of Charleston. Hogan's supporters now set themselves to the reinforcement of his argument by additional opinions from a distance. They prejudged their own case egregiously, in the present instance, by marshaling in their defence a sensational adventurer, as plain facts disclose him, although he is pretentiously described in the defensive pamphlet of the occasion as the "Rt. Rev. Dr. John Rico of the Order of St. Francis, D. D. (*sic*), and Vicar General of the Armies of Spain." His opinion, then, was thus pompously paraded on the "Differences existing between the Rt. Rev. Dr. Conwell

Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908